

# **HLC 9-26-03 RETREAT NOTES**

## **and**

### **HLC/PLANNING**

### **2003-2004 WORKPLAN**

*Present: Gloria Sciara, Stephen Polcyn, Michael Youmans, Avelino Legaspi, Justine Leong, Edward Janke, Patt Curia representing PAC SJ, Joe Horwedel, Sally Notthoff Zarnowitz and Courtney Damkroger, city staff.*

*Chair Sciara opened the meeting. Joe Horwedel went over the current budget process and stated that both staff positions are now supported half by General Fund and half by fees. He gave a brief overview of the Getting Families Back to Work process initiated by the Mayor and provided handouts to the Commission from that process. Horwedel noted the facilitation and streamlining emphasis of the process and encouraged the HLC to think creatively about historic preservation processes in light of this effort and staff limitations.*

*There was general support by the HLC to streamline HP processes as long as there is assurance that qualified historic preservation staff review work and oversee the program. Chair Sciara suggested development of a checklist for determining compliance with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards to assist in streamlining review.*

*PAC SJ stated concern about lessening opportunities for public input especially in light of the revisions to the Public Outreach Policy.*

The HLC comments (in italics) on the HLC/Planning Workplan follow.

#### **HLC Oversight and staffing:**

Staff time: SNZ days per year 135; CD days per year 98

- I Monthly HLC Meeting Support (General Fund) (SNZ 41; CD 56)
  - 1. Meeting Preparation
    - ? Agenda
    - ? Synopses
    - ? Drafting/review of staff reports HP permits
    - ? HL designations
    - ? HRI individual additions, includes noticing
    - ? Review of staff reports for referrals
    - ? Preparation/follow up for HLC review of EIRs
    - ? Preparation/follow up for Petitions & Communications

*HLC proposes:*

- ? *elimination of the January and July meetings*

- ? *limiting the number of referrals to projects that do not comply with the Standards, are controversial and sending some projects to the Design Review Committee only. An example is the door proposed for PF Changes at 98 S. Second Street where comments from DRC rather than the full Commission would have been sufficient.*
- ? *Commissioner (Chair/Vice Chair) drafting of EIR comment letters*
- ? *Requiring Petitioners at HLC meetings to assemble their own information and not rely on staff to do so. Consider changing the agenda language to reflect this.*

2. HLC special meetings, tours, retreats, training (General Fund) (5 days per year; SNZ 2; CD 3)

II Monthly Design Review Committee Meeting (General Fund)—schedule projects, prep agenda, meeting notices, coordination of applicants, synopses (18 days per year: SNZ 12; CD 6)

*HLC proposes:*

- ? *Staff and DRC work on process improvements*
- ? *HPO not to attend regularly*
- ? *Strictly enforce time limitations*

III Permit Processing (Fee Supported): (SNZ 49.5; CD 16.5)

1. HP permits
2. Mills Act contracts

*HLC strongly supports an HP Adjustment/Amendment process to streamline review for landmarks where the Adjustment/Amendment is reviewed by qualified staff.*

III Administration (General Fund): (SNZ 31.5; CD 19)

1. Time at Planning Counter
2. Updating applications and website, answering counter questions and training
3. General public historic resource information directed to HP staff—phone calls, emails, letters
4. Draft historic district application form
5. Revise Mills Act (Historical Property Contract) form
6. Performance Evaluations

V CLG Annual Report (General Fund) (1.5 day/year; SNZ 1; CD .5)

### **Process Improvements:**

Staff time: SNZ days/year 1; CD days/year 15

I Amend HP permit process for an adjustment and amendment process, will require ordinance change (General Fund). (September- January, 5 days/year; CD 5)

*HLC strongly supports an HP Adjustment/Amendment process to streamline review for landmarks where the Adjustment/Amendment is reviewed by qualified staff. HLC also supports charging fees for HP permits, Adjustments and Amendments, but stated their concerns that the current fee structure does not adequately cover the costs of administering the permit. Consider different fee structure for different types of HP permits i.e. single family, multi-family, commercial and industrial.*

II Completion of the Conservation Area study (General Fund)—draft ordinance provisions, reconcile with Single Family House Permit process, City Attorney review, meet with working group, take to HLC and PC, City Council. (6 months to complete, 11 days/year; CD 10; SNZ 1)

*HLC was concerned about the time commitment but felt the project should be finished.*

III Streamline Designation Process—HLC suggested that the landmark designation process be streamlined such that HLC initiates and City Council designates, reducing two hearings at each body to one hearing each. HLC supported pursuing this when time allows.

**Current Projects:**

Staff time: SNZ days/year 21.5; CD days/year 11.5

- I Design Guidelines adoption (General Fund)
1. Adoption of Your Old House: A Guide to Preserving San Jose Homes—adopted, need to publicize and make available at Planning counter and other public information sites (1 day/year; CD 1)
  2. Downtown Design Guidelines (General Fund)
    - a. Make revisions requested by City Council, integrate with Downtown Zoning Ordinance, take to City Council (3 days to be completed by October 26, 2003; CD 3)
    - b. Review and revise Downtown Design Guidelines for applicability outside the National Register Commercial District. (to be completed by February 2004, 10 days/year; SNZ 9; CD 1).
    - c.

II Rezoning River Street Historic District area (General Fund) (Complete by February, 6.5 days/year; SNZ 6.5; CD .5)

*HLC recommends eliminating this from the current workplan.*

III HP general assistance to planning staff on permits and projects (General Fund) (12 days/year; SNZ 6; CD 6)

**Environmental Review:**

Staff time: SNZ days/year 11; CD days/year 84) (with little allowance for GP amendments or Capital Improvement Projects)

I EIR review (Fee Supported)—the following estimates are for EIRs. Planning typically receives 8 to 10 EIRs/year with an average review of 2 days for a standard EIR and 4 to 6 days for a controversial EIR. 10 EIRs at 4 days/EIR: (CD 40 days)

The following list represents EIRs currently on file:

1. Brandenburg
2. GE Monterey Road GPA comments (Circulating)
3. Greyhound Parking Garage (ADEIR)
4. Downtown Strategic Plan (pending submittal)
5. 126 Viola (in scoping)
6. KB Auzerai/Del Monte (in scoping)
7. 507 Almaden (in scoping)
8. General Plan Amendments
9. Capital Improvements Projects—there are 250 projects many of which could involve historic resources.

II Other Environmental Review--review of historic reports (typically 1 per week) and Initial Studies/Mitigated Negative Declarations, general environmental assistance to planning staff. (24 days/year; SNZ 6; CD 18)

III Coyote Specific Plan (Fee Supported)—attend meetings (3 to 4 per month at 2 hours each), review and comment on consultant report (4 days), scope environmental (2 days). (SNZ 3; CD 6)

IV NHPA/NEPA Review (Fee Supported) (SNZ 2; CD 20)

1. Approximately 6 CDBG projects per year (9 days/year; CD 7; SNZ 2)
2. Airport Acoustical Treatment (Fee Supported)
  - a. Facilitate federal review process, includes working with FAA and California Office of Historic Preservation on drafting Memorandum of Agreement (5 days/year; CD 5)
  - b. Facilitate local review process and Review windshield surveys of properties to be treated (1,100) (3 days/year; CD 3)
3. VTA Silicon Valley Rapid Transit Corridor review of cultural resource survey and evaluation, environmental documents (5 days/year; CD 5)

**Survey work:**

Staff time: SNZ days/year 24; CD days/year 17.5

I East Downtown Frame Survey (EDFS) (General Fund): the survey was accepted by HLC and CC in early 2003. Work remaining to process the survey includes:

1. Process inventory additions, 50 properties every other month—August 2003 through June 2004 (30 days/year; SNZ 24; CD 6)

- II Japantown Historic Context and Reconnaissance Level Survey (General Fund)
  - 1. RFP responses due September 25, 2003 (4 days/year; CD 4)
  - 2. Project timeline—October 2003 through September 2004 (7 days/year; CD 7)
- III Pending survey project requiring preparation and/or review by HPO and HLC (General Fund)
  - 1. Martha Gardens for the Specific Plan (.5 days/year; CD .5)

### **Current HLC Committees:**

Design Review (Justine Leong, Chair; Gloria Sciara, Steve Polcyn)

St. James Park—currently inactive (Avelino Legaspi; Michael Youmans; Steve Polcyn)

Ad Hoc Survey Committee—currently inactive (Steve Polcyn, HLC liaison)

Standard permit language for Historical Archeology—currently inactive (Avelino Legaspi)

History San Jose Collections Committee (Michael Youmans HLC Liaison)

Japantown Survey Committee (Stephen Polcyn, HLC liaison)

Coyote Valley Specific Plan Technical Advisory Committee (Need HLC liaison)

*It was suggested that there be one HLC member serving as the committee alternate. Each committee member is responsible for contacting the alternate if the member is not able to attend the committee meeting. In the absence of Commissioner Paim, the alternate was not selected. Avelino Legaspi volunteered to work with Michael Youmans on the History San Jose Collections Committee. Edward Janke stated his interest in the Coyote planning process as well as the Design Review Committee. Final committee composition will be determined at the November 5, 2003 HLC meeting.*

### **Other Comments:**

*PAC SJ voiced an interest in developing a salvage policy and program. PAC SJ also suggested development of improved permit conditions and mitigation measures.*

### **Future Training:**

*Commissioners would like training on: Incentives; State Historic Building Code (with St Helena Building Official, Cindy Heitzman); Green Buildings and Sustainability; Planning Process, Jargon and the General Plan process.*

### **Retreat Evaluation:**

- ? *Retreat time devoted to budget woes, like creative solutions to problems.*
- ? *Would like to see the process streamlined so HP works better.*
- ? *Would like bottled water at the HLC meetings.*
- ? *Liked dessert with retreat.*
- ? *HLC members would like feedback about the Commission itself.*